



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,242	02/01/2001	Fumio Nagasaka	107926	7319

25944 7590 02/07/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/701,242

Applicant(s)

NAGASAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: None.  
Claim(s) objected to: None.  
Claim(s) rejected: 3,4,13-16 and 21-26.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the claims 3, 4, 13-16, 21-26 are rejected with the cited prior arts of the final office action, dated 10/19/2005. Applicant proposed amending the rejected claimed subject matter, with additional limitations to alter the scope of the claimed limitations, for example, "wherein said application unit, specifies an individual description ..., said application unit gains access to database ..., said application unit obtains a device description mapped ..., said application unit causes at least one of the obtained device ..., said application unit gains access to the device, causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed, wherein said control unit specifies an individual description, said control unit gains access to a database, said control unit obtains a device description, said control unit causes at least one of the obtained device description, said control unit gains access to the device, said control unit specifies a position mapped, said control unit reads a device description, said control unit obtains the read-out device description, said control unit gains access to a database, said control unit obtains a device description, said control unit causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description, said control unit specifies an individual description of the desired person, said control unit gains access to a database, etc., require further consideration and/or search.

Regarding the applicant's request dated 1/19/2006 to setup an interview with the examiner; the examiner denies the interview request. MPEP 713.09, clarifies "... Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search should be denied". Since, the examiner is not convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal can be accomplished and it would require further more than nominal consideration, the interview request is not granted. Also, please refer to the previous interviews and the response to the applicant's arguments that already exist in the prosecution of this case, regarding the claimed limitations. Also, the additional limitations, for example, "wherein said application unit, specifies an individual description ..., said application unit gains access to database ..., said application unit obtains a device description mapped ..., said application unit causes at least one of the obtained device ..., said application unit gains access to the device, causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed, wherein said control unit specifies an individual description, said control unit gains access to a database, said control unit obtains a device description, said control unit causes at least one of the obtained device description, said control unit gains access to the device, said control unit specifies a position mapped, said control unit reads a device description, said control unit obtains the read-out device description, said control unit gains access to a database, said control unit obtains a device description, said control unit causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description, said control unit specifies an individual description of the desired person, said control unit gains access to a database, etc., require further consideration and/or search, hence, the interview is denied.